UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,347	09/22/2003	Teruyuki Maruyama	243043US2	7039

22850   7590   11/28/2008
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
LAI, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2457	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/28/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/665,347	MARUYAMA, TERUYUKI
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL C. LAI	2457	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 August 2008*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-24 and 42-48* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-24,42-48* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/17/2004*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communication filed on 8/15/2008.

   Claims 1-24 and 42-48 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. The examiner has acknowledged the amended claims 1-15, 17-24, 42-45, 47-48

   and cancelled claims 25 and 49. Claims 1-24 and 42-48 are pending. Claim

   objections to claims 18-22 have been fixed and withdrawn accordingly. The 101

   rejections on claims 1-16, 18-21, 23, 25, 42-45, 47 and 49 are withdrawn as the

   issues being fixed or the claims cancelled. The 112 second paragraph rejections

   to claims 1-25 and 42-49 are also withdrawn as the issues have been fixed.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, see page 28, filed 8/15/2008, with respect to the 112 first

   paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of

   claims 1-25 and 42-49 under 112 first paragraph has been withdrawn.

4. Applicant's argument, see page 30, with respect to "the '786 patent fails to

   disclose <u>a controller including a server processing part, a condition acquisition</u>

   <u>control part, and a service providing part,</u> as defined in Claim 1" and "The '786

   patent does not disclose a controller including each of the manager 110, the

   agent 106, and the application cited in the Office Action", is not persuasive. The

   newly added limitations "<u>a controller including</u> a server processing part... a

   condition acquisition control part... and a service providing part..." have no

   support in the specification (see the new 112 first paragraph rejection below).

   Besides, the '786 patent does disclose a controller including each of the manager

110, the agent 106, and the application (see column 6, lines 61-65, "The

manager 110 can be run on the same host 100 as other web service system 90

components, such as one of the web servers 102 or an interceptor 120, or on

another computer of sufficient capacity"). Either way the '786 patent (Yamane)

meets the limitations.

5. Applicant's argument, see pages 30-31, with respect to "the '786 patent fails to

disclose <u>a condition acquisition control part configured to control, in response to</u>

<u>an instruction from the server processing part, acquisition of target information</u>

<u>designated by the process request from a management apparatus, connected to</u>

<u>the Web service providing apparatus via the communication network, that</u>

<u>manages the target information based on a first processable condition under</u>

<u>which the target information is processable by the management apparatus and</u>

<u>the Web service providing apparatus.</u> Rather, the '786 patent discusses that a

web interface provides an agent 106 with information from the "back end" of the

web server 102, such as information about web page requests received from

users, and the pages sent in response to the requests", is not persuasive. The

agent 106 serves as an intermediary between the manager 110 and any other

software running on the host 100 (see column 9, lines 22-24). The agent 106 is

in communication with the one or more web servers 102 on that host 100 via the

web server interface 104 associated with each web server 102 (see column 9,

lines 29-32). The manager 110 can instruct the agent 106, and the agent will

instruct the web server interface 102, to send some or all of the information

included in Table 3 (see column 10, lines 43-45). As such, the '786 patent

suggests that the agent 106 perform the functionalities of a condition acquisition control part as defined in the claim.

6. Applicant's argument, see page 31, with respect to "The '786 patent does not disclose that the agent 106 is configured to control acquisition of target information from a management apparatus, connected to the Web service providing apparatus via the communication network. Further, the '786 patent does not disclose that the acquisition of target information is controlled based on a first processable condition under which the target information is processable by the management apparatus and the Web service providing apparatus, as defined in Claim 1", is not persuasive. As discussed above, the agent 106 is in communication with the one or more web servers 102 on that host 100 via the web server interface 104 associated with each web server 102. The '786 patent further discloses that the web pages presented to the user in response to web page requests from the user's web browser can be stored on the host 100 or on a **file system** accessible to the web server 102, or they can be generated by the web server 102 by processing data available to the web server 102. For example, for web pages documents about a topic, the web pages can be written (designed) and stored in the web server 102 file system. In response to a web page request, such a web page can be sent to the user just as it is stored in the file system. In a banking transaction system, however, it is likely that information about the user's bank account will be stored in a **database**. The web server 102 can generate a web page containing the user's account information each time the user requests the page. Often, web pages are stored partially in the file system,

and partly are generated by the web server 102 when the request is made (see column 5, lines 29-45). As such, the '786 patent suggests that the agent 106 is configured to control acquisition of target information from a management apparatus, connected to the Web service providing apparatus via the communication network and the acquisition of target information is controlled based on a first processable condition under which the target information is processable by the management apparatus and the Web service providing apparatus, as defined in Claim 1.

7. Applicant's argument, see page 31, with respect to "the '786 patent fails to disclose a service providing part configured to perform the requested process on the target information and to send a result of the process to the server processing part" and "The '786 patent does not disclose that the application is configured to perform the requested process on the target information and to send a result of the process to the server processing part, as defined in Claim 1", is not persuasive. The '786 patent discloses that an aggregation of related web pages presented to a user as a set of web pages about a related topic, or from a particular source, usually, but not always from the same web server 102, is referred to as an application. One example of an application is a set of pages providing information about a company. Another example of an application is a series of pages that allow a user to conduct transactions with her savings bank (see column 5, lines 6-13). Thus the application does perform the requested process on the target information and to send a result of the process to the

server processing part (the manager) and eventually to the user, as defined in Claim 1.

8. Applicant's argument, see page 32, with respect to "the '786 patent fails to disclose the condition acquisition control step and the service providing step recited in Claim 17", is not persuasive. Please see responses of items 5 and 7 above.

9. Applicant's argument, see pages 33-34, with respect to "the '786 patent fails to disclose a process request interpretation part configured to interpret a process request to request the process in accordance with a predetermined protocol and to inform the service providing part of the process" and "the '786 patent does not disclose that the interceptor 120 is configured to interpret a process request to request the process in accordance with a predetermined protocol and to inform the service providing part of the process", is not persuasive. The '786 patent discloses that the web page requests can be made using hypertext transfer protocol ("http") format, and also can be made using other protocols that provide request capability (see column 4, lines 56-59) and that the interceptor 120 is the point of first contact for a user. The interceptor 120 receives a web page request from a user and "refers" the user's web browser to an appropriate web server 102 for that request (see column 7, lines 11-14). Thus the '786 patent does suggest that the interceptor 120 is configured to interpret a process request to request the process in accordance with a predetermined protocol and to inform the web application of the process as defined in claim 18.

10. Applicant's argument, see page 34, with respect to "the '786 patent fails to disclose the service providing step and the process request interpretation step recited in Claim 22", is not persuasive. Please see responses of item 9 above.

11. Applicant's argument, see page 35, with respect to "the '786 patent fails to disclose a terminal comprising a display unit, a process request creation part, a process response interpretation part, and a display control part, as defined in Claim 23", is not persuasive. The web service disclosed by the '786 patent implies that there is a user terminal creating a service request to a web service system and processing the response from the web service system before displaying the results to the user. The '786 patent discloses the console 116 that communicates with the web service system the same way as a user terminal (see column 20 line 50 through column 21 line 52) communicates with the web service system and thus meets the limitations.

12. Applicant's argument, see page 36, with respect to "the '786 patent fails to disclose the process request creation step recited in Claim 24", is not persuasive. Please see responses of item 11 above.

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 42 and 46-48 are similar to claims 1, 17, 18 and 23. Please see responses above.

14. In view of the foregoing, the rejection to independent claims 1, 17, 18, 23, 24, 42, 46-48 and all dependent claims sustain as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

15. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to

which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

16. Claims 1-11, 18-21, and 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

A controller (controller 1300) is depicted in FIG. 2 and described in pages 60-62 of the original specification as "The controller 1300 comprises ASIC 1301, MEM-C 1302, HDD (Hard Disk Drive) 1303, CPU (Central Processing Unit) 1304, NB (North Bridge) 1305, MEM-P 1306, SB (South Bridge) 1307 and AGP (Accelerated Graphics Port) 1308, each of which will be well-known by those skilled in the art, as illustrated in FIG. 2". The controller was added to overcome the 101 rejection but it doesn't include those "parts" as defined in claims 1, 18, and 42. As such, the newly added limitations "a controller including a server processing part... a condition acquisition control part... and a service providing part..." are not supported in the specification.

All dependent claims (2-11, 19-21, 43-45) are rejected also due to the dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

17. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an

application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

18. Claims 1-14, 17-24, and 42-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamane et al. (US 6,317,786 B1, hereinafter Yamane).

Regarding claim 1, Yamane discloses a Web service providing apparatus, comprising:

A controller including

a server processing part configured to control receipt of a process request for a process from a requesting apparatus connected to the Web service providing apparatus via a communication network and transmission of a process response corresponding to the process request to the requesting apparatus in accordance with a predetermined protocol [Manager FIG. 1 and col. 16, lines 19-31];

a condition acquisition control part configured to control [Agent FIG. 3], in response to an instruction from the server processing part, acquisition of target information designated by the process request from a management apparatus, connected to the Web service providing apparatus via the communication network, that manages the target information based on a first processable condition under which the target information is processable by the management apparatus and the Web service providing apparatus [col. 9, lines 22-37]; and

a service providing part <u>configured to perform</u> the requested process on

the target information and to send a result of the process to the server

processing part [col. 5, lines 6-28, application].

Regarding claim 2, Yamane further discloses <u>wherein the controller includes</u>

<u>a processor configured to execute</u>

a program including the condition acquisition control part and the service

providing part [Agent FIG. 1 and col. 9, lines 22-37];

a control service managing a hardware resource used in the process

[Agent, col. 11 Table 1]; and

an operating system controlling the program and the control service [col.

9, lines 22-24].

Regarding claim 3, Yamane further discloses <u>wherein the controller includes</u>

a client processing part <u>configured to control</u>, in response to an instruction issued

by the condition acquisition control part, transmission of a process request to the

management apparatus and receipt of a process response from the management

apparatus in accordance with the predetermined protocol [Web Server Interface

FIG. 1 and col. 14 line 26 through col.16 line 17].

Regarding claim 4, Yamane further discloses wherein the condition

acquisition control part comprises;

a sequence control part <u>configured to control</u> a sequence of processes to

acquire a second processable condition regarding the target information from

the management apparatus and internally acquire a third processable

condition regarding the target information in the Web service providing

apparatus [col. 9 line 63 through col. 12 line 20, Agent interaction with

Manager]; and

a condition determination part <u>configured to determine</u> the first

processable condition based on the second processable condition and the

third processable condition acquired by the sequence control part [col. 12 line

21 through col. 14 line 25, Agent interaction with Web Server Interface].

Regarding claim 5, Yamane further discloses <u>wherein</u> the sequence control

part comprises:

a first control part <u>configured to control</u> the client processing part so as to

acquire the second processable condition from the management apparatus

by sending a process request for the second processable condition to the

management apparatus [col. 9 line 63 through col. 10 line 28];

a second control part <u>configured to control</u> the client processing part so as

to acquire the third processable condition from the Web service providing

apparatus by internally issuing a process request for the third processable

condition to the server processing part [col. 10 lines 29-45];

a determination instruction part <u>configured to cause</u> the condition

determination part to make the determination based on the second

processable condition and the third processable condition [col. 12 lines 14-

45]: and

an information acquisition part <u>configured to acquire</u> the target information

from the management apparatus in accordance with the first processable

condition determined by the condition determination part [col. 13 line 19

through col. 14 line 25].

Regarding claim 6, Yamane further discloses wherein the client processing

part comprises:

a process request creation part <u>configured to</u>, in response to an instruction

issued by the sequence control part, create a process request, which is to be

sent to the management apparatus, corresponding to the instruction in

accordance with the predetermined protocol [Web Server Interface FIG. 1 and

col. 14, lines 26-49]; and

a process response interpretation part <u>configured to </u>interpret a process

response, which is received from the management apparatus, corresponding

to the process request and to inform a result of the interpretation to the

sequence control part [col. 13, lines 38-67, Agent interface with Web Server].

Regarding claim 7, Yamane further discloses wherein the service providing

part comprises a service execution part <u>configured to </u>execute the process

corresponding to the process request received from the requesting apparatus or

<u>a process request that is </u>internally created [col. 5, lines 6-28, application].

Regarding claim 8, Yamane further discloses wherein the server processing

part comprises:

a process request interpretation part <u>configured to</u> interpret the process

request to request the process on the target information in accordance with

the predetermined protocol [Interceptor FIG. 1 and col. 7, lines 29-65]; and

a process response creation part <u>configured to</u> create a process response

to indicate a result of the process in accordance with the predetermined

protocol [Web Server Interface FIG. 1 and col. 14, lines 26-49].

Regarding claim 9, Yamane further discloses wherein the process request

interpretation part comprises:

a determination part <u>configured to</u> determine whether the process request

is to acquire the target information from the management apparatus [col. 8,

lines 9-50]; and

a notification part <u>configured to</u> inform the condition acquisition control part

of the process request based on a result of the determination made by the

determination part [col. 8 line 51 through col. 9 line 20].

Regarding claim 10, Yamane further discloses wherein the process response

creation part comprises a control result creation part <u>configured to</u> create a

process response to indicate a result of the control of the condition acquisition

control part in accordance with the predetermined protocol [Web Server Interface

FIG. 1 and col. 14, lines 26-49].

Regarding claim 11, Yamane further discloses wherein the condition

acquisition control part comprises:

an attribute information acquisition part <u>configured to</u> acquire attribute

information regarding the target information from the management apparatus

[col. 9 line 63 through col.10 line 5]; and

a third control part <u>configured to</u> cause the client processing part to

internally issue the process request for the process on the target information

to the client processing part based on the attribute information [col. 10 lines

46-67],

wherein the service providing part is <u>configured to</u> execute the process

requested by the requesting apparatus via the server processing part based

on the attribute information.

Regarding claim 12, Yamane further discloses a display part, the display part

comprising:

a display part including

a first display part <u>configured to</u> display a list of selectable apparatuses

that a user is allowed to select among apparatuses connected via the

communication network [FIG. 6 and col. 21, lines 34-49];

a second display part <u>configured to</u>, when the user selects a desired

apparatus from the list of apparatuses, display a list of information items

managed by the management apparatus [FIG. 7 and col. 21, lines 49-52]; and

an apparatus determination part <u>configured to</u>, when the user designates

a desired information item from the list of information items and the desired

apparatus from the list of selectable apparatuses, determine the designated

apparatus as a processing apparatus to perform the process [col. 20 line 50

through col. 21 line 33].

Regarding claim 13, Yamane further discloses wherein the second display

part is <u>configured to</u> display the information items in a reduced size on the

display part [FIG. 7 vs. FIG. 6].

Regarding claim 14, Yamane further discloses wherein the requesting

apparatus is one of the Web service providing apparatus, the management

apparatus and a terminal connected to each other via the communication

network [col. 8 line 51 through col. 9 line 2].

Regarding claim 17, Yamane discloses a method of providing a Web service

for a Web service providing apparatus, the method comprising:

a server processing step of controlling receipt of a process request for a

process from a requesting apparatus connected to the Web service providing

apparatus via a communication network and transmission of a process

response corresponding to the process request to the requesting apparatus in

accordance with a predetermined protocol [Manager FIG. 1 and col. 16, lines

19-31];

a condition acquisition control step of controlling, corresponding to an

instruction from the server processing step, acquisition of target information

designated by the process request from a management apparatus<u>, connected

to the Web service providing apparatus via the communication network, that

manages</u> the target information based on a first processable condition under

which the target information is processable by the management apparatus

and the Web service providing apparatus [Agent FIG. 1 and col. 9, lines 22-

37]; and

a service providing step of performing the requested process on the target

information and informing the server processing step of a result of the

process [col. 5, lines 6-28, application].

Regarding claim 18, Yamane discloses a Web service providing apparatus,

comprising:

a controller including

a service providing part configured to manage target information and to

provide the target information to a processing apparatus, which performs a

process on the target information, in accordance with a first processable

condition received from the processing apparatus [col. 5, lines 6-28,

application];

a process request interpretation part configured to interpret a process

request to request the process in accordance with a predetermined protocol

and to inform the service providing part of the process [Interceptor FIG. 1 and

col. 7, lines 29-65]; and

a process response creation part configured to create a process response

to indicate a result of the process in accordance with the predetermined

protocol [Web Server Interface FIG. 1 and col. 14, lines 26-49].

Regarding claim 19, Yamane further discloses wherein the service providing part comprises a processable condition providing part <u>configured to</u>, in response to receipt of a process request to acquire a second processable condition with respect to the processing apparatus, send a process response to indicate the second processable condition in accordance with the predetermined protocol, and after the transmission of the process response to indicate the second processable condition, the service providing part <u>being configured to provide</u> the target information to the processing apparatus in accordance with the first processable condition received from the processing apparatus [col. 5, lines 6-28, application].

Regarding claim 20, Yamane further discloses:

a process request creation part <u>configured to</u> create the process request to request the process in accordance with the predetermined protocol [col. 12, lines 22-46, Agent interface with Web Server Interface]; and

a process response interpretation part <u>configured to</u> interpret the received process response corresponding to the process request [col. 13, lines 38-67, Agent interface with Web Server].

Regarding claim 21, Yamane further discloses a display part, the display part comprising;

A display part including

a first display part <u>configured to</u> display a list of selectable apparatuses

that a user is allowed to select among apparatuses connected via a

communication line [FIG. 6 and col. 21, lines 34-49];

a second display part <u>configured to</u>, when the user selects a desired

apparatus from the list of selectable apparatuses, display a list of information

items managed by the selected apparatus [FIG. 7 and col. 21, lines 49-52];

and

an apparatus determination part <u>configured to</u>, when the user designates

a desired information item from the list of information items and the desired

apparatus from the list of selectable apparatuses, determine the designated

apparatus as the processing apparatus [col. 20 line 50 through col. 21 line

33].

Regarding claim 22, Yamane discloses a method of providing a Web service

for a Web service providing apparatus, the method comprising:

a service providing step of managing target information and providing the

target information to a processing apparatus to perform a process on the

target information based on a first processable condition received from the

processing apparatus [col. 5, lines 6-28, application],

a process request interpretation step of interpreting a process request to

request the process in accordance with a predetermined protocol and

informing the service providing step of the process [Interceptor FIG. 1 and col.

7, lines 29-65]; and

a process response creation step of creating a process response to

indicate a result of the process in accordance with the predetermined protocol

[Web Server Interface FIG. 1 and col. 14, lines 26-49].

Regarding claim 23, Yamane discloses a terminal, comprising:

a display unit;

a process request creation part configured to create a process request to

cause a first apparatus to acquire target information managed by a second

apparatus from the second apparatus and perform a process on the target

information in accordance with a predetermined protocol, wherein the first

apparatus, the second apparatus, and the terminal are connected to each

other via a communication network [col. 12, lines 22-46, Agent interface with

Web Server Interface];

a process response interpretation part configured to interpret a process

response corresponding to the process request and configured to acquire a

result of the process performed by the first apparatus [col. 13, lines 38-67,

Agent interface with Web Server]; and

a display control part configured to display the result of the process on a

display unit of the terminal [Console FIG. 1 and col. 20, lines 49-65].

Regarding claim 24, Yamane discloses a computer- readable storage

medium having embedded therein instructions, which when executed by a

processor, cause a terminal to perform a method, comprising:

a process request creation step of creating a process request to request a first apparatus to acquire target information managed by a second apparatus from the second apparatus and perform a process on the target information in accordance with a predetermined protocol, <u>wherein the first apparatus, the second apparatus, and the terminal are connected to each other via a communication network</u> [col. 12, lines 22-46, Agent interface with Web Server Interface];

a process response interpretation step of interpreting a process response corresponding to the process request and acquiring a result of the process of the first apparatus [col. 13, lines 38-67, Agent interface with Web Server]; and

a display control step of displaying the result of the process on a display unit of the terminal [Console FIG. 1 and col. 20, lines 49-65].

Regarding claim 42, Yamane discloses a web service providing apparatus, comprising:

<u>a controller including</u>

a service providing part <u>configured to</u> perform a process on target information received from a management apparatus that manages the target information in accordance with a first processable condition and to provide a result of the process to the management apparatus [col. 5, lines 6-28, application];

a process request interpretation part <u>configured to</u> interpret a process request for the process in accordance with a predetermined protocol and to

inform the service providing part of the process [Interceptor FIG. 1 and col. 7, lines 29-65]; and

a process request creation part <u>configured to</u> create a process response to indicate a result of the process in accordance with the predetermined protocol [col. 12, lines 22-46, Agent interface with Web Server Interface].

Regarding claim 43, Yamane further discloses wherein the service providing part comprises a processable condition providing part <u>configured to</u>, in response to receipt of a process request to acquire a second processable condition with respect to the management apparatus, send a process response to indicate the second processable condition in accordance with the predetermined protocol, and after the transmission of the second processable condition, the service providing part being <u>configured to</u> provide a result of the process on the target information received from the management apparatus in accordance with the first processable condition [col. 5 line 29 through col. 7 line 28].

Regarding claim 44, Yamane further discloses:

a process request creation part <u>configured to</u> create the process request for the process in accordance with the predetermined protocol [col. 12, lines 22-46, Agent interface with Web Server Interface]; and

a process response interpretation part <u>configured to</u> interpret the received process response corresponding to the process request [col. 13, lines 38-67, Agent interface with Web Server].

Regarding claim 45, Yamane further discloses a display part, the display part

including:

a first display part <u>configured to</u> display a list of selectable apparatuses

that a user is allowed to select among apparatuses connected via the

communication line [FIG. 6 and col. 21, lines 34-49];

a second display part <u>configured to</u>, when the user selects a desired

apparatus from the list of selectable apparatuses, display a list of information

items managed by the selected apparatus [FIG. 7 and col. 21, lines 49-52];

and

an apparatus determination part <u>configured to</u>, when the user designates

a desired information item from the list of information items and the desired

apparatus from the list of selectable apparatuses, determine the designated

apparatus as a processing apparatus [col. 20 line 50 through col. 21 line 33].

Regarding claim 46, Yamane discloses a method of providing a Web service

for a Web service providing apparatus, the method comprising:

a service providing step of performing a process on target information

received from a management apparatus managing the target information in

accordance with a first processable condition and providing a result of the

process to the management apparatus [col. 5, lines 6-28, application];

a process request interpretation step of interpreting a process request to

request the process in accordance with a predetermined protocol and

informing the service providing step of the process [Interceptor FIG. 1 and col.

7, lines 29-65]; and

a process request creation step of creating a process response to indicate

a result of the process in accordance with the predetermined protocol [col. 12,

lines 22-46, Agent interface with Web Server Interface].

Regarding claim 47, Yamane discloses a terminal, comprising:

A display unit;

a process request creation part <u>configured to</u> create a process request to

cause a first apparatus to perform a process on target information managed

by a second apparatus by sending the target information to the first apparatus

in accordance with a predetermined protocol<u>, wherein the first apparatus, the

second apparatus, and the terminal are connected to each other via a

communication network</u> [col. 12, lines 22-46, Agent interface with Web Server

Interface];

a process response interpretation part <u>configured to</u> interpret a process

response corresponding to the process request and to acquire a result of the

process performed by the first apparatus [col. 13, lines 38-67, Agent interface

with Web Server]; and

a display control part <u>configured to</u> display the result of the process on a

display unit of the terminal [Console FIG. 1 and col. 20, lines 49-65].

Regarding claim 48, Yamane discloses a <u>computer- readable storage

medium having embedded therein instructions, which when executed by a

processor, cause a terminal to perform a method</u> comprising:

a process request creating step of creating a process request to cause a

first apparatus to perform a process on target information managed by a

second apparatus by sending the target information to the first apparatus,

wherein the first apparatus, the second apparatus, and the terminal are

connected to each other via a communication network [col. 12, lines 22-46,

Agent interface with Web Server Interface];

a process response interpretation step of interpreting a process response

corresponding to the process request and acquiring a result of the process

performed by the first apparatus [col. 13, lines 38-67, Agent interface with

Web Server]; and

a display control step of displaying the result of the process on a display

unit of the terminal [Console FIG. 1 and col. 20, lines 49-65].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art
are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to
a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Yamane as applied to claim 1, and in view of Butterworth et al. (US

2004/0133656 A1, hereinafter Butterworth).

Regarding claim 15, Yamane discloses the claimed invention except for

wherein the communication network is one of a network communication line

including a wireless LAN, a serial communication network including an infrared

communication, and a parallel communication line. Butterworth teaches a

networked computer environment 300 that supports a distributed web service.

The computer network 300 includes a client computer 302 connected to a

communication link 304, which may be any wired or wireless communication link

[FIG. 3 and para. 0006]. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Butterworth's

teaching into Yamane's method for the purpose of having communication lines

like a wireless LAN, a serial communication line, or a parallel communication line

in the system such that the users can communicate with the web service provider

to obtain services.

Regarding claim 16, Yamane discloses the claimed invention except for

wherein the predetermined protocol is a Simple Object Access Protocol.

Butterworth teaches that messages between clients and web services may use

SOAP (Simple Object Access Protocol) [para. 0012]. It would have been obvious

to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

incorporate Butterworth's teaching into Yamane's method for the purpose of

defining a uniform way of passing XML-encoded data and defining a way to

perform remote procedure calls using HTTP (or another transport protocol) as

the underlying communication protocol by using a SOAP, thereby increasing the

opportunities for reuse, as the service places essentially no constraints on the

platform, language, or location of its clients [para. 0012].

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Lai whose telephone number is (571) 270-3236. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael C. Lai
21NOV2008

/Yves Dalencourt/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2457